



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,305	03/29/2004	Michael John Wray	1509-494	8275
22879 7590 12/07/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER YOUNG, NICOLE M	
			ART UNIT 2139	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/07/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/811,305

Applicant(s)

WRAY ET AL.

Examiner

Nicole M. Young

Art Unit

2139

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to the Amendment of application 10/811,305 received September 9, 2007. Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-10 and 12 have been amended.

Drawings

New formal drawings have been submitted and the objection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 8, 9, and 11 have been amended and the 112 rejection have been withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-12 have been amended and the objections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wiseman et al. (US 7,216,369)** hereinafter Wiseman and further in view of **Sutton, II et al. (US 2003/0229794)** hereinafter Sutton.

Wiseman teaches in **Claims 1 and 12** a system comprising a trusted computing platform, Wiseman does not teach but Sutton teaches including one or more first logically protected computing environments (or "compartments") associated with initialisation of said system,

and one or more second logically protected computing environments (or "compartments"),

the one or each said second logically protected computing environment being associated with at least one service or process supported by said system in paragraph [0024] "one or more trusted applications". It would be obvious to one of skill in the art at the time of invention to have multiple trusted applications. The motivation would be that a computer would need a "variety of applications, or code sequences" as in paragraph [0024] to operate and they need to be secure,

the system being arranged to load onto said trusted computing platform a predetermined security policy including one or more security rules for controlling the operation of each of said logically protected computing environments (Wiseman column 3 lines 52-62, wherein the policy table 120 is interpreted by the Examiner to be the predetermined security policy and the policies are interpreted to be the security rules.),

such that said security rules relating to the or each first logically protected computing environment are arranged to be loaded onto said trusted computing platform when the system is initialized (Wiseman column 3 lines 60-62 where the “policy table 118 contains policies to which the platform 102 must adhere during the initialization/boot process”. The platform is interpreted by the Examiner to be the system.),

and the one or more security rules relating to the or at least one of said second logically protected computing environments are only arranged to be loaded onto said trusted computing platform if one or more services or processes associated therewith are enabled (Wiseman column 4 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform)

Claim 2 discloses a system according to claim 1, wherein one or more common variables are defined for each compartment, in respect of which the relevant security rules are only arranged to be added if that variable is enabled for a particular compartment (Wiseman column 5 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform).

Claim 3 discloses a system according to claim 2, wherein one or more of a number of variables associated with a directory of plug-ins are arranged to be added (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required).

Claim 4 discloses a system according to claim 3, wherein the system is arranged to determine, in response to a compartment being enabled, the status of said variables

and cause the relevant plug-in(s) to run only if an associated variable is 'true' (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The Examiner interprets the flag to be a variable that is 'true').

Claim 5 discloses a system according to claim 4, wherein the or each compartment includes an operating system compartment arranged to be controlled by the operating system kernel (Sutton paragraph [0023] teaches a trusted kernel and paragraph [0024] and multiple operating systems, teaches the operating system controlled by the kernel).

Claim 6 discloses a system according to claim 5, wherein the compartments and network resources are arranged so communication between them is provided via relatively narrow kernel level controlled interfaces to a transport mechanism (Sutton paragraph [0030]).

Claim 7 discloses a system according to claim 6, wherein said communication interfaces are arranged to be governed by rules specified on a compartment by compartment basis (Wiseman column 5 lines 42-55 teach the policies initialization during boot and lines 62-67 teach comparing the policies to the component or platform).

Claim 8 discloses a system according to claim 7, including means for determining when a service is starting, and on being enabled, for loading the compartment associated with that service and loading the security rules associated with that service (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The structure is shown in Figure 1.).

Claim 9 discloses a system according to claim 8, including means for determining when a service starts, and causing said security rules to be loaded accordingly (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required. The structure is shown in Figure 1.).

Claim 10 discloses a system according to claim 1, wherein the or each compartment includes an operating system compartment arranged to be controlled by the operating system kernel (Sutton paragraph [0023] teaches a trusted kernel and paragraph [0024] and multiple operating systems, teaches the operating system controlled by the kernel).

Claim 11 discloses a system according to claim 1, including means for determining when a service is starting, and on being enabled, for loading the compartment associated with that service and loading the security rules associated with that service (Wiseman column 5 lines 56-61 where the sections are interpreted by the examiner to be the plug-ins and a flag indicates which are required).

Note: Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior arts of record and in the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. Applicant should consider the entire prior art as applicable to the limitations of the claims. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing for response, to consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior arts or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant argues that the "Applicants recite a system that loads security rules at initialization and when services are enabled, while Wiseman appears to only disclose a system that initiates policies at initialization only". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner sites claim 1, "wherein ...compartment is only arranged to be loaded into said trusting computing platform if one or more services or processes therewith are enabled. The most reasonable broadest interpretation of this claim includes that no more services or processes are enabled, and therefore initializing only at start up discloses claim 1. The Examiner cites Wiseman column 3 lines 60-62 where the "policy table 118 contains policies to which the platform 102 must adhere during the initialization/boot process". The platform is interpreted by the Examiner to be the system.

The Applicant argues that Sutton "fails to suggest loading a security rule when a service or policy is started". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The operating system in itself is a specialized service and when it is initialized the security rules associated with it are loaded. The Examiner cites Sutton teaches including one or more first logically protected computing environments (or "compartments") associated with initialization of said system in paragraph [0024].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole M. Young whose telephone number is 571-270-1382. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, alt Fri off, 8:00am-5:30pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/811,305
Art Unit: 2139

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NMY
11/28/2007


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100